

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD	2
M.1. 52.217-5 Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990)	2
M.2. ORO M01 Evaluation General (MAY 1997)	2
M.3. ORO M05 Evaluation Criteria (MAY 1997)	3
M.4. ORO M15 Overall Relative Importance of Evaluation Criteria (Alternate I) (MAY 1997)	5

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1. 52.217-5 Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise options(s).

M.2. ORO M01 Evaluation General (MAY 1997)

- (a) Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with applicable DOE and Federal acquisition policies and procedures. Evaluation will be performed to determine the offeror's past performance, understanding of work to be performed, technical approach, potential for completing the work as specified in the solicitation, price reasonableness, the probable cost to the Government, and ranking with competing offerors.
- (b) Award will be made to the responsible offeror, whose offer, conforming to this solicitation, is considered the best value to the Government, considering the Evaluation Criteria in this Section M.
- (c) In accordance with the clause in Section L entitled, "52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisition," the Government intends to make award without discussion. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint.
- (d) However, DOE reserves the right to conduct written and/or oral discussions with all offerors whose offers are in the competitive range. The extent of discussions with the offerors in the competitive range will depend on the circumstances of the procurement and the offerors' proposals as submitted. The written and/or oral discussions are intended to assist the Source Evaluation Board in accomplishing (1) a full understanding of the offers and their strengths and deficiencies based upon the individual efforts of each offeror; and (2) assurance that the meanings and points of emphasis of solicitation provisions have been adequately conveyed to the offerors.

Once discussions have been held with all firms in the competitive range, all will be offered the opportunity to submit a revised proposal by a common cutoff time and date. That is, all firms will be given the opportunity to revise their offer to reflect the results of discussions. If the revised proposal is received after the established common cutoff time or date, it shall be handled in accordance with FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to

Offerors - Competitive Acquisition. Each revised proposal shall contain the signed contract offer of the proposer.

M.3. ORO M05 Evaluation Criteria (MAY 1997)

- (a) Technical and Business Management Criteria. Technical aspects of proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria, which are listed in descending order of importance. Within each criterion, sub criteria are either listed in descending order of importance, or are approximately equal in weight.

CRITERION 1. Business Management (40%)

Sub Criterion 1a. – Leadership and Organization (20%) The proposal will be evaluated on the degree to which it demonstrates: an organizational structure capable of performing the Statement of Work, a key personnel management team with relevant leadership, experience, qualifications, commitment, and availability as described in the resumes; and the Offeror's plan for retention of key personnel qualifications and/or capabilities equal to or greater than those proposed.

Sub criterion 1b. – Managing Human Resources (10%) The degree to which the Offeror demonstrates the capability to develop and administer a comprehensive human resource management program that is designed to promote excellent performance by a skilled, competent and diverse work force, including the Offeror's capability to manage pay, benefits packages, and any other benefit administration items.

Sub criterion 1c. – Transition Plan (10%) The Offeror's Transition Plan will be evaluated to the degree the Plan addresses transition of the work and staffing necessary in order to minimize impacts on continuity of operations and mitigate risks during this crucial transition period.

CRITERION 2: Technical Approach (30%)

The proposal will be evaluated on the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an adequate technical understanding of the work set forth in the respective Section C. In addition, the proposal will be evaluated **on the degree to which it relates an adequate approach and sufficient systems and reflects how the offeror intends to efficiently and effectively accomplish the requirements in a customer-focused and timely manner.** The proposal will also be evaluated on the degree to which it demonstrates sound

approaches to implementing an Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) program and an Integrated Safety Management Systems (ISMS) program; and the proposed process to coordinate with DOE federal staff, Management and Operating contractors (M&O), Environmental Management contractors (EMC) and other contractors to accomplish the work set forth in the respective Section C.

CRITERION 3: Corporate Experience (20%)

DOE will evaluate the offeror's relevant experience in performing work similar in scope and complexity to that set for in the respective Section C. For purposes of the experience evaluation, DOE will evaluate the experience of the offeror and its major subcontractors. In the case of a joint venture and/or Limited Liability Company (LLC) formed for the purpose of competing for this contract, DOE will evaluate the experience of each member.

CRITERION 4: Past Performance (10%)

The offeror's past performance will be evaluated on the basis of information furnished by the offeror's customers on contracts (including current contracts) similar in size, scope and the work set forth in the respective Section C. References other than those identified by the offeror, and other sources of information including the information requested in Section L, may also be used by the Government in evaluating this criterion. DOE may evaluate past performance on fewer than the total number of contracts if all the completed questionnaires are not returned. If the offeror does not have a record of relevant past performance information or if such information is not available, the offeror will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably. The government will consider in its evaluation the relevance of the offeror's past performance information, the offeror's discussion of past performance problems, and the corrective actions taken to resolve those problems. DOE will evaluate the past performance of the major subcontractors, and in the case of a joint venture and/or LLC, the members of the newly formed entity.

- (b) **Price Criteria:** Price realism, probable cost to the Government and price analysis will be conducted to ensure that the Government receives a fair and reasonable price. The DOE will evaluate each offeror's proposed price (including transition cost) for realism, reasonableness and completeness. The realism evaluation includes an analysis of the specific elements of each offeror's proposed price to determine whether the proposed labor hours and

Other Direct Costs are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's technical proposal. The evaluation of price reasonableness includes those considerations described in FAR 31.2.

Based on its review, DOE will determine a most probable price (which includes transition) to the Government to use for the evaluated price.

M.4. Basis of Contract Award

Selection will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each offeror's proposal against the evaluation criteria. Evaluated price will not be point scored. In determining the best value, the Government will assess whether the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing technical proposals indicates a superiority from the standpoint of: (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated price to the government would be to take advantage of the difference. The Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one technical proposal over another. If after evaluation, two or more offers are considered essentially technically equal, price to the Government may be the deciding factor for award.

Page Blank